DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 005 CS 503 324

AUTHOR Frank, David A.
TITLE "Shalom Achshav"--The Rituals of the Israeli Peace Movement.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (San Jose, CA, February 14-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Conflict Resolution; Content Analysis; *Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; *International Relations; *Linguistics; Peace; *Rhetoric; Rhetorical Criticism; Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Israel

ABSTRACT

Noting that rhetorical critics have ignored the study of nonwestern movements and have failed to construct theories that help to explain and interpret the rhetorical form of such movements, this paper synthesizes concepts from rhetorical theory and anthropology to explain the linguistic process that made up the 1978 Israeli peace movement. The first section of the paper discusses Robert Cathcart's theory of rhetorical movements, which explains movements as a kind of "agnostic ritual" whose most distinguishing rhetorical form is confrontation. The second section discusses the Israeli peace movement and evaluates the rhetorical strategies used by the movement's leaders and members and by the defenders of the existing order. The final section discusses the effects of the peace movement, especially its "influential relationships" (indirect consequences). (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201005

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"SHALOM ACHSHAV" - THE RITUALS OF THE ISRAELI PEACE MOVEMENT

by

David A. Frank

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David A. Frank

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

David A. Frank (M.A., Western Washington University, 1979) is a doctoral student and a graduate teaching fellow in the Rhetoric and Communication Area of the Department of Speech at the University of Oregon. This paper was presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Jose, California, February 16, 1981, and was awarded the Executive Club's prize for the outstanding debut paper.

CS503 24c

ABSTRACT

Rhetorical critics have ignored the study of non-western movements, and have not paid serious attention to the construction of theories which help to explain and interpret the rhetorical form of movements. This study attempts to fill both voids by synthesizing concepts from rhetorical theory and anthropology to explain the linguistic process which made up the Israeli peace movement. An assessment of the rhetorical strategies and a listing of the indirect consequences of the movement is provided to complete the critical act.

"SHALOM ACHSHAV" - THE RITUALS OF THE ISRAELI PEACE MOVEMENT

". . . nationalism in any mask, is an archaic poison . . . . For reasons at once tragic and illustrious, the Jew ought to be among the carriers of this peregrine vision . . . . Zionism, in the foundation of a closed state, of a state necessarily armed to the teeth among enemy neighbors, has also been a step back into that mass of untruths which we call history. Inevitably, it has narrowed the self critical universality, the ironic suppleness of the Judiaic tradition."[1]

- George Steiner

Founded as a response to European Judophobia, the pogroms of Russia and the ovens of Hitler's Germany, the nation and people of Israel have sought, but have never experienced a period of stable peace. Yet, it is a paradox that war, and the threat of war, have overshadowed significant internal divisions which have the potential of dividing and destroying Israel from within.[2] As a result, informed observers have suggested that ". . . there will be no large scale crisis such as the emergence of a mass protest or resistance movement . . . ."[3] In particular, internal resistance to Israeli foreign and military policy has, historically, been insignificant. Sociologists Glazer and Glazer in their survey of Israeli war resisters conclude:

> The war resister's league - Israel's one pacific organization - is not well known (and) remains inactive . . . . There is very little likelihood that pacifists or even political resisters will have any serious impact on the military or political policies of Israel.[4]

Thus, the spontaneous and unpredicted emergence of a large Israeli peace movement during the early months of 1978 surprised Middle Eastern scholars, the maximalist government of Menachem Begin, and even leftist/dovish factions of the Israeli polity. The movement gave voice to many Israelis who wish to incorporate into a social reality the visions of

fellowship and peace gained when Egyptian President Anwar el-Sadat made his dramatic pilgrimage to Jerusalem on November 19, 1977. The members and leaders of the movement symbolically confronted a government and a social order which they perceived to value land over peace and war over a flexible negotiation policy. The response of the establishment to the confronters was to isolate them, to treat them as moral lepers and to accuse movement leaders of planning a military "putsch."[5] This confrontation and response constituted a social drama which gained national and international attention. The purpose of this study is to (1) utilize and further develop Professor Robert Cathcart's movement framework which explains such dramas as a kind of "agonistic ritual" whose most distinguishing rhetorical form is confrontation, and (2) illuminate and critically evaluate the rhetorical strategies used by the members and leaders of the movement to accomplish their goals.

The Ritual of Confrontation: Cathcart's Theory of Rhetorical Movements.

There are a number of theoretical constructs that can be used to explain and evaluate the rhetoric of a movement.[6] This "pluralistic approach permits the critic to select a specific method which seems best adapted to a particular rhetorical situation."[7] Michael Leff urges critics to "vibrate" different theories against the critical object to determine through "trained intuition" that theory which best explains the rhetorical event or process.[8]

In following Leff's advice, it would appear that Windes and Smith's innovational theory of movements would not fit this particular case, for the Israeli peace movement clashed directly with the dominant groups and

value hierarchy of the established society.[9] Neo-Aristotelian and Bitzerian methodologies would help to categorize and describe the rhetoric of the movement but could not go far in explaining the nature of the rhetoric used by the movement leaders and members.[10] While other methods could be used, it would appear that Robert Cathcart's extension of an earlier article would best explain the rhetorical form of the Israeli peace movement.[11] Specifically, the Israeli peace movement's leaders and members used confrontation as an important tactic and the nature of the movement's encounter with the establishment could be said to be an example of an agonistic ritual or ritual conflict.

Cathcart's theory is an attempt to provide a rhetorical definition of movement. Cathcart argues that such a definition "could make us masters of our own house rather than slaves to historians and social scientists."[12] Yet, rhetoric is or should be a house with many mansions and it is helpful to share our homes with other social scientists (as Cathcart does when he draws upon ethology for agonistics and anthropology for ritual) when it helps us to fulfill the critical function. If we agree to McGee's suggestion that rhetorical scholars ought to study movements as a "linguistic process contained in and defined by the rhetorical situation, not the rhetorical event,"[13] then the special province of rhetorical criticism of movements and the duty of the critic is to identify, categorize, explain and evaluate the persuasive strategies which merge and mingle in the linguistic process which makes up the movement. At the same time, if we are to illuminate the linguistic process of the movement, we should not be reluctant to use the tools of

any discipline which has a serious concern with communication.

To explain the notion that True Movements can be defined by their involvement in an agonistic ritual, Cathcart borrows the ideas of ritual from anthropology and agonistics from ethology. He then links these ideas with Scott and Smith's theory of the rhetoric of confrontation.[14] While rhetorical scholars are familiar with the rhetoric of confrontation, a more complete explanation of ritual and agonistics than Cathcart offers may help to expand the vistas of the rhetorical critic.

Rituals are pervasive symbolic events which occur in both aboriginal and industrial societies.[15] Be it a Fourth of July celebration or an African Pygmy sacrifice, rituals are proscribed forms of behavior which ". . . may be thought of as the link in the network by which the social meaning of actions and relationships is exchanged and communicated."[16] Anthropologists have long studied human rituals based on the assumption that:

> . . . . rituals reveal values at their deepest level . . . . Men express in ritual what moves them most, and since the form of expression is conventional and obligatory, it is the values of the group that are revealed . . . the study of rituals (is) the key to an understanding of the essential constitution of human societies.[17]

Ritual behavior occurs during periods of societal imbalance. Such behavior serves to restore the equilibrium when changes in the moral judgments impend or have occurred. Anthropologists have discovered that rituals serve to establish boundries on the actions of individuals and groups of individuals in order to moderate the costs of escalated violence and unlimited conflict.[18] Thus, ritual allows individuals and

groups of individuals to clash and permits societal values to change without revolution or warfare. American presidential elections are a prime example of such ritual. Cathcart paraphrases the following paragraph from H. L. Nieburg's article "Agonistics - The Rituals of Conflict," to highlight the functions of ritual behavior:

> Ritual action is the redressive, reconciling means of reaffirming loyalties, testing and changing them at times or offering new ones to replace the old, but expressed in a kind of muted symbolic display which changes attitudes and values without major and unlimited conflict . . . . The potential for disruptive revolutionary change by escalated violence and internal warfare is always present, unpredictable . . . costly . . . (and) dangerous in the secondary conflicts which may be engendered; ritual controls and moderates these undesirable tendencies.[19]

Agonistics denotes conflict behavior which is symbolic, playful or ritualistic.[20] As a form of ritual, human agonistics refers to symbolic conflict which provides for the low risk testing of societal values in a social arena. Nieburg uses the rhetoric of confrontation and provocation exhibited by young radicals protesting the Viet Nam war as an example. The radicals were surprised by the violent reactions of the police to their rhetoric, for they "were not supposed to take much of the rhetoric seriously; they were not supposed to respond with violence. The ritual was supposed to be performed as a kind of metaphor and symbolic warning."[21] In open societies, such confrontation takes place rhetorically, often through movements, marches, parades, and campaign rhetoric. In closed societies, such confrontation is crushed by an establishment which "maintains its power, not through moral righteousness but through its power to kill, actually or symbolically, those who challenge

it."[22] The Russian intervention in Hungary to halt a movement sparked by the Petőfi circle is a case in point.

Agonistic rituals are thus redressive, symbolic actions, bound by societal conventions which prevent dysfunctional conflict. Cathcart argues that True Movements can be defined by the occurrence of an agonistic ritual in which two agents are juxtaposed: one standing for the "erroneous system and the other upholding the new of "'perfect' order."[23] Movements viewed as agonistic rituals are a special type of rhetorical events characterized by discrete sector of a society symbolically rejecting the values of the existing order and a response from the establishment which treats "the confronters as moral lepers and attempts to isolate them and pin the anarchist label on them."[24]

Working from these touchstones, Cathcart uses Scott and Smith's concept of confrontation to describe the rhetorical form of the True Movement. Confrontational rhetoric, according to Cathcart's interpretation of Scott and Smith's article, is a "totalistic strategy."[25] True Movements using confrontational rhetoric as a totalistic strategy assume a Manichean world view and choose only those rhetorical strategies which completely separates the True Movement from the existing order.[26] Put simply, there is no adjustment or adaptation to the values of the representatives of the existing order. To adjust or to adapt is to do business with the Devil.

It is here that Cathcart's definition of a rhetorical movement is rejected by scholars in the field.[28] Zarefesky's criticism that Cathcart confuses one rhetorical strategy with the exclusive definition of a move-

ment is most persuasive.[29] This conceptual weakness becomes even more apparent when we are reminded that Scott and Smith's theory included confrontational rehtoric as a non-totalistic tactic.[30] A movement may be confrontational in motive and intent, but may exhibit rhetorical strategies which are managerial or that are intended to purify the existing order. That is, it could very well be that the best way to institute true changes in societal norms and value hierarchies is to utilize a rhetoric which confronts from without and purifies from within.

Could it be that truely astute movement leaders and members will adjust the movement's rhetoric to the particular situation - and as such, use confrontational rhetoric as one of many rhetorical strategies and tactics used to achieve changes in the social order? Could it be that leaders and members of movements which use confrontational rhetoric as a tactic could also "sound the conservative voice" by suggesting that the establishment had distorted or betrayed the true values of the social order?[31] An illustration of such an approach will be seen in the rhetoric of the Israeli peace movement.

The concepts of agonistic ritual and confrontation help to explain the nature and form of movement rhetoric. However, two additional concepts can be drawn from anthropology to illuminate the linguistic process seen during the inception and evolution of the Israeli peace movement. The first concept - rites of passage - can be helpful in explaining the communication behavior exhibited during the inception of a movement. Another form of ritual, social drama, allows the critic to break down the rhetoric of the movement into identifiable phases. With these

conceptual tools at hand, the methodologies of the critic can be expanded.

Rites of Passage.

Rituals can be either consummatory or instrumental intent. The symbolic actions which constitute ritual may serve to reinforce or change existing beliefs about a culture's values and social order. One category of ritual, first described by Belgian folklorist Arnold van Gennap, is the familiar "rites of passage."[32] Such rites have been observed to have a tripartite structure and serve to move individuals or groups of individuals from one social status, or from one set of values, to another social status or set of values. Marriage ceremonies and puberty rites are two examples. The first phase of a rite of passage is characterized by a separation of a group or individual from a given social structure or set of values. The communication behavior observed at this stage emphasizes detachment and division.[33]

The second phase is one of liminality. Here, the mundane and the particular are transcended by a concern for the humane and the universal. It is at this stage that traditional barriers of separation are destroyed in order that individuals and groups may evolve beyond outdated structures of the social order.[34] In liminality ". . . normal time and space are distored, social structure falls away, and traditional roles fade to be replaced by an undifferentiated brotherhood among participants."[35]

It is during periods of liminality that individual and group fantasies are created and played out. "It is through fantasy that ritual behavior is projected and assimilated."[36] Most important to the rhetorical scholar is the knowledge that movements which develop "in a seemingly

spontaneous and unanticipated fashion often reflect vision gained during the ritual process."[37] As will be seen, the inception of the Israeli peace movement which arose in a spontaneous and unanticipated fashion can be explained by the concept of liminality. It is during liminality that previous morals and standards are criticized and fresh and novel modes of communication are devised. Since the view of reality seen during this phase is attuned to the universal, the rhetoric heard during periods of liminality also reflect the themes of the universal.

The third phase of a rite of passage marks the incorporation of the fantasies gained during liminality into a tangible social reality.[38] As a result, groups and individuals, previously separated, are now reincorporated into a new or previously existing social order.

Social Drama.

Rituals can also take the form of social dramas which are contestations between influential "paradigm holders."[39] In his book, Myth, Fields and Metaphors, anthropologist Victor Turner defines paradigms as rules "from which many kinds of sequences of social action may be generated but which further specify what sequences must be excluded."[40] Paradigm holders, according to Turner, are conscious human agents whose life choices are guided by these rules. Additionally, there are root or ruling societal paradigms which guide the choices made by groups.[41]

Social dramas are a type of agonistic ritual and result when paradigm holders disagree and clash in a societal arena. Rites of passage and the experience of liminality may radically alter the paradigms of large numbers of individuals. However, others in the same society may not be

as greatly affected due to deeply engrained ideologies or paradigms. Thus, a rite of passage may give rise to a social drama consisting of a conflict between actors in a society who wish to install or defend a particular value hierarchy.[42]

Turner outlines four main phases of a social drama: breach, crisis, redressive action, and reintegration.[43] His work is of particular interest to the movement scholar, for the anthropological theory of social drama is similar to the dramatistic position of Kenneth Burke, resembles in part the stages of movements posited by Bowers and Ochs, and contains some of the ideas related to Scott and Smith's theory of confrontation.[44] To this degree, it is important to note the cross-discipline consensus on these concepts. This provides for a stronger theoretical basis for the study of movement.

Turner's framework of social drama allows the movement scholar to break down the movement into linguistic phases. Each of the phases has "its own speech forms and style, its own rhetoric, its own kinds of non-verbal language and symbolisms."[45] Turner concludes that:

> These (dramas) vary greatly of course cross-culturally and cross-temporally, but I postulate that there will be certain important generic affinities between speeches and languages of the crisis phase everywhere, of the redressive phase everywhere, of the restorative phase everywhere.[46]

A <u>breach</u> is ". . . signaled by the public, overt breach or deliberate nonfulfillment of some crucial norm regulating the intercourse of the parties."[47] Although an act of dissidence, physical violence is avoided. It is a "symbolic trigger of confrontation or encounter."[48] Here, an individual or group of individuals symbolically confront and

attempt to change through non-violent means, the "root" paradigm of the social order.

Once a breach of the root social paradigm has been recognized, a phase of crisis may follow. The conflict between paradigm holder may escalate and the "true state of affairs is revealed."[49] A breach may be quickly resolved if the difference between paradigm holders is insignificant. However, the breach may be significant: ". . . taking up its menacing stance in the forum itself, and as it were, dares representatives of the order to grapple with it. It cannot be ignored or wished away."[50] If the society has capable redressive and mediatory machinery then the crisis may be resolved through negotiation and other conflict management schemes.[51] If the redressive machinery is inadequate, the breach may regress to a state of crisis. Finally, the social drama may reach a phase of reintegration. The individual or group who has challenged a significant societal paradigm may be either reintegrated into the social order or a permanent schism is recognized.[52]

As a rhetorical method, a synthesis of the overarching notion of agonistic ritual with the concepts of the rite of passage and social drama, serves to categorize and interpret the rhetorical form of particular movements. As Lewis has demonstrated in his study of the Middle East peace ritual, it is reasonable to assume that the Israeli peace movement originated from a rite of passage.[53] It also appears that the struggles and progressions of the peace movement closely resemble the stages of a ritualistic social drama. The following graphic model helps to explain how the framework is conceptualized and how the model "fits"

the rhetorical form of the Israeli peace movement.

Movement Stage:	Liminality	Breach	Crisis	Mediation	Incorporation
Rhetorical Form:	Universal	Symbolic Confrontation	Response to confrontation by establishment.	Negotiation	Reunification.
Application: Israeli Peace Movement	Sadat Pilgrimage; 11-19-77	Reserve Officers Letter; 3-7-78	Finance Minister Erlich's Response 4-3-78	Peace Now Leaders meet with Begin; 4-21-78	Begin returns from Camp David; 9-22-78

The next section utilizes this framework to study the linguistic process which made up the Israeli peace movement. The focus of the study will be on the categorization and evaluation of the rhetorical strategies used by the movement leaders and members and those used by the defenders of the existing order.

The Peace Now Movement

Lewis has suggested that the events which led to the birth of the Israeli peace movement can be best explained as a response to a "peace ritual." Lewis concludes that the Israeli image of the Middle Eastern social order was dramatically changed as a result of a rite of passage exhibiting the three phases of separation, liminality and incorporation.[54]

A Rite of Passage: Sadat's Pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

Separation. In the years and months that immediately preceded Anwar

Sadat's mission to Jerusalem, the Israeli image of the social order was bound to a world view characterized by a disbelief that Egypt or any other Arab country desired peace and that there was strong probability of a sixth Arab-Israeli war.[55] Lewis cites a June, 1977 Jerusalem Post poll which revealed that 90% of the Israeli-Jew population anticipated another war in the near future.[56]

The communication behavior between Israeli and Egyptian was reflective of phases of separation.[57] D. Ray Heisey's study of the rhetoric of the Arab-Israeli conflict revealed that dysfunctional rhetoric and non-communication constituted the nature and form of the communication between the nations of Israel and Egypt from 1948 to 1970.[58] It can be easily demonstrated that the communication behavior was no different up until Sadat's voyage in 1977.

Liminality. Sadat's trip to Israel on November 19, 1977 initiated a powerful symbolic alternative to a future of conflict and violence. Sadat's presence in Israel, Begin's return visit to Egypt, and the interaction of the Egyptian and Israeli peoples through the mediums of travel and television moved the peace ritual into a phase of liminality. The ceremonies and symbols associated with the Sadat initiative inalterably changed the world view of many Israelis. They closed, to a significant degree, the gulf of physical, psychological and symbolic separation that had existed between Egyptian and Israeli.[59] Lewis has identified four changes in the Israeli vision of the social order that were a result of the peace ritual.[60] First, an end to warfare between Israel and Egypt became a realistic alternative:

> Before Sadat's journey to Jerusalem, all Jewish Israelis, with the exception of a small number of leftists, agreed that peace was not achievable in the present, irrespective of the actions of the Israeli government . . . . Symbols expressed in liminality directly challenged this assumption. The vision of amicable relations between Israel and Egypt so forcibly developed on this occasion transformed the conception of peace in the minds of many Israelis from a situation achievable only in the mythical future, to a realistic alternative to the present.[61]

A second consequence of the peace ritual was a recognition of common goals and aspirations shared by Israeli and Egyptian. Common cultural and religious traditions were recognized. Finally, the common humanity shared by the two peoples became cognizant.[62]

Sadat's voyage allowed many Israeli's, tired of a constant state of war, to play out fantasies of peace. Perhaps Sadat's speech to the Knesset best captured the impact of liminality on the rhetoric of the occasion. According to David Ross, Sadat successfully projected a "similarity both of attitudes and values,"[63] and focused on the ". . . similarity which existed between Arab and Israeli . . . . To an audience with deeply held religious values, Sadat expressed shared sentiments."[64] Finally, "To an audience who distrusted Egyptian sincerity, Sadat sought to convince his audience that they shared with Egypt both a hatred of war and a love of peace."[65] Significantly, polls taken after Sadat's visit to Jerusalem indicated that Israeli attitudes toward Egyptian intentions and the possibilities of peace improved markedly.[66]

This change in the social vision of many Israeli is fundamental to an understanding of the subsequent rise and rhetorical form of the Israeli peace movement. The peace ritual profoundly altered the hopes and values of many of the Israeli people by reversing a presumption which favored war. No longer were they to be tied to images of distrust

and conflict and a future of war. The period of liminality allowed many Israeli people gain, what they perceived to be, a vision of universal brotherhood and realistic chance of peace with their Egyptian neighbors.[67]

Failure of Incorporation. Unfortunately, the months following Sadat's trip to Israel did not bring fulfillment of this vision of a new social order peace. The euphoria of the Sadat pilgrimage faded when the visions of peace were to be translated into political realities. Debate on the West Bank settlements and failures of military talks in Cairo and Diplomatic Committee Meetings in Jerusalem, returned the Middle Eastern social order to the climate of separation which had existed previous to the Sadat initiative.[68]

With the exception of those on the ideological right, many Israelis felt a deep sense of disappointment at these turn of events.[69] These Israelis began to assess the situation to determine who was at fault.

Israelis of the ideological right had been suspicious of Egyptian motives from the beginning of the Sadat initiative. For these Israelis, the failure of the "Israeli and Egyptian officials during the incorporation reconfirmed the futility in trying to reach an understanding with the Arabs."[70] This attitude directly reflects the root paradigm of the Israeli society operating at that time. An understanding of this root paradigm is a necessary foundation for this study and can be gained through a brief overview of Prime Minister Menachem Begin's philosophies.

The crimes of Nazi Germany are not forgotten by the Jews of Israel. Memorials to the murdered, such as Yad Vashem, remind Israeli Jews of the past and appear to influence the policies of the present. Prime

Minister Menachem Begin's values are largely based on his experiences of the holocaust. Nafrau Safran explains Begin's character in this manner:

> In the early 1940's Mr. Begin began to view the situation of the Jews in terms of holocaust and redemption . . . what is striking is the intensity with which Mr. Begin holds to that perception, the persistence of its hold on him, and his application of it to particular situations.[71]

As a disciple of the revolutionary Jabotinsky, Begin believes that Jews not hesitate to fight. As the leader of the terrorist group Irgun Zvai Lemui, Begin often translated this philosophy into reality.[72] Begin also adheres to the vision of "Eretz Israel." As Begin explains:

> "Eretz Israel," literally the "land of Israel," has been regarded since Biblical times as the motherland of the Children of Israel. It has always comprised what came subsequently to be called Palestine on both sides of the river Jordan . . . .[73]

Begin was elected Prime Minister during the summer of 1977. His philosophies were representative of the root social paradigm that had existed before the peace ritual. This paradigm ". . . supported a consensus in favor of the status quo and the nationalistic impetus to settle and annex territories captured from the Arabs in the Six Day War of June, 1967."[74] Criticism of this paradigm, from any quarter, was frequently dismissed and equated with anti-semitism. Although verging on overstatement, Noam Chomsky's observation is helpful here: "Anyone associated with the peace movement or the American left who has opposed expansionist or exclusive tendencies within Israel (has) been reviled . . . as a supporter of terrorism and reactionary Arab states, an opponent of democracy (and a) anti-semite . . . ."[75]

An Israeli Social Drama.

Breach. The origins of a significant contemporary breach against this paradigm precedes the Sadat initiative and can be traced to a small Jerusalem organization of young people who called themselves the "Movement for a Different Zionism."[76] Formed two weeks after the election of Prime Minister Begin, the members of this movement feared that the conservative, maximalist policies of the new administration would provoke another war. The leaders and members of the movement argued that a true Zionism should include Palestinian autonomy and a flexible negotiating policy.[77] During the February following Sadat's initiative, the movement participants began to discuss methods of exerting pressure on the Begin government to prevent further Gush-Emunim (an organization of religious zealots) settlements on the West Bank of the Jordan.

At the same time, young men from Tel Aviv, who held similar views, joined forces with the Jerusalem movement. It was decided that the first act designed to change the government's policies should take the form of mass signed letters addressed to the Prime Minister's office "respectfully" protesting the Begin approach to peace.[78]

The first letter gaining attention and wide publicity in the media was authored by nine reserve officers of the Israeli Defense Force (IDF). In support of the protest, and at the urging of the nine authors, 341 additional reserve officers affixed their signatures to the letter.[79] The "Reserve Officers Letter" became the Magna Carta of the subsequent peace movement. The officers wrote that ". . . for the first time we feel that new horizons are being opened for the State of Israel for

peace and regional cooperation, we feel obligated to call upon you to refrain from steps that may be a cause for tears for generations for our people . . . ."[80] The three principles stressed in the letter by the officers reflected the values gained during the period of liminality. Initially, the letter stated that the officers had no wish to rule over a half million Arabs; the value of further territorial expansion was contested; and the officers urged the abandonment of using ancient history as a guide for making contemporary policy.[81]

In addition to the importance of the letter as a statement of principle, the status of the signatories must not be neglected. The authors used the word "officers" to suggest that they were and had contributed to the Israeli society; a move intended to indicate purity of motive.[82] The authors did hold positions of legitimate power and credibility. All were from combat units and many had been awarded medals for bravery and courage. For example, Yuval Neviya, one of the original nine had been awarded the American equivalent of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Since the very existence of Israel is perceived by Israelis to depend on the commitment and the devotion of the officers and soldiers of the IDF, the letter took on an important meaning. As Lewis concludes, "doubt in the virtue of government policy expressed so openly by so many reserve officers was an important political statement."[83]

The most important consequence of the letter was the spontaneous and widespread expression from thousands of Israelis in support of the letter. Although the authors had intended the letter to be a "one time shot"[84] and "never dreamed [they] were going to start a great movement,"[85] when

numerous phone calls and letters were received by the authors commending them for their action, it became apparent that the letter had tapped the feelings many Israelis had acquired during the peace ritual.

Prime Minister Begin's reaction revealed the significance of the breach. Reportedly, Begin was "deeply wounded" by the letter and sought to isolate the officers by suggesting that "Whereas the petitioners represented only "mere hundreds' he had been elected by many hundreds and thousands."[86] As a result, the authors of the letter perceived a need to respond to what Smith and Windes have labeled a "mobilizational exigence."[87] Such exigencies arise when there is a ". . . need to integrate the behavior of adherents and to create agencies for propagating persuasive messages."[88]

Initially, an identifying slogan evolved. When members of the Tel Aviv group ordered a sticker entitled "Shalom Achshav" (Peace Now) from a local artist, overnight the slogan became the logos of the movement. It is interesting to note that members of the movement did not like this slogan, for it implied that the movement desired an immediate peace regardless of its character or safeguards.[89]

With the new identifying slogan and the knowledge that many citizens concurred with the three principles delineated in the Reserve Officers' Letter, the Tel Aviv and Jerusalem groups responded to the mobilizational exigence by calling for a mass rally in the largest square in Tel Aviv: Kikar Madchie Israel. Although underfinanced and poorly planned, the rally attracted nearly 35,000 people on the evening of April 1, 1978.[90] Participants held colorful posters which captured the

purpose of the movement: "Security, not Settlements," "Zionist Values not Territories," "Flexibility requires Change." Petitions were circulated containing "carefully" and "respectfully" worded requests to the Prime Minister to prevent further settlements on the West Bank and to avoid the paths of extremism.[91] Poetry and Bible readings, songs and speeches were also used by movement members to express the philosophies of the newly founded movement. Perhaps the poster reading "A Land of Peace Instead of a Piece of Land" best summed up the intent of the movement.[92]

The Reserve Officers' Letter and the mass rally were significant breaches against ruling paradigm of the social order. This breach symbolically separated the movement's adherents from the value hierarchy of the existing order and marked the overt inception of a new peace movement.

Crisis. That the Peace Now movement was a True Movement in the Cathcartian sense and that the social drama had entered into a phase of crisis, is illustrated by Finance Minister Erlich's criticism of the Reserve Officers' Letter. Erlich observed: "I detect the flavour of a military putsch in all those anti-governmental noises."[93] Peace Now Officials demanded an apology and a retraction.[94] Erlich refused, and the Liberal and Likud parties issued statements severely critical of the Peace Now movement.[95] The Liberal party claimed that the Peace Now slogan was representative of the appeasement policies of Neville Chamberlain and argued that the slogan should read "A Secure Peace." The Likud accused the peace movement of damaging the government's peace initiatives

by giving the impression to international observers that the government lacked popular support.[96]

While the institutions of the establishment limited their attacks to pejorative criticism, a backlash protest movement formed in opposition to the Peace Now movement. Headed by painter Heman Abrhanson, the movement called itself the "Movement for a Secure Peace."[97] Later investigations suggested that Begin's political party may have played a significant role in the formation of this counter movement.[98]

Other counter rhetors joined the fray. On April 6, a group calling themselves "Reserve Privates (Not Officers)" distributed leaflets in Haifa in support of the Begin government.[99] Meanwhile, the Secure Peace movement planned a rally in response to the earlier Peace Now rally and collected numerous signatures in support of the government's settlement policy.[100] Rhetors from the general public challenged the leaders of the Peace Now movement to be specific in their demands.[101] Some even suggested that the Peace Now movement was illustrative of a disunity which "was responsible for the fall of the Jewish Commonwealth 2,000 years ago."[102] Finally, other observers pointed to the fact that many of the movement's adherents were young, Ashkenazi Jews who were well educated representatives of socialist kibbutizim.[103]

The Secure Peace movement attracted over 30,000 Israelis to a rally held during the second week of April. Using expressions similar in shape and form, but different in content and intent than those heard at the earlier Peace Now rally, participants voiced their support of the Begin administration's policies. Leaders pointed to the "many" reserve officers

in the throng and Gideon Shiponi (a war hero) delivered a speech in which he denigrated the Peace Now movement.[104]

Failure of Mediation and Regression to Crisis. In an attempt to defuse the situation, Prime Minister Begin and three representatives of Peace Now met in Jerusalem on April 21. Peace Now leaders pressed for territorial compromise on the West Bank, argued that Begin's policies weakened Israel abroad, and presented Begin with 60,000 signatures in support of a flexible policy.[105] Begin defended his policies and is quoted as saying "We've been in government for only nine months."[106] to which Omri Padan, one of the trio, responded "The damage you've done to Israel's image in nine months is worse than your predecessors did in twenty years."[107] Then, according to Newsweek, "Begin gave the student activist a stare and replied, "Don't lecture me, young man."[108] Neither side gained much from the meeting, and the Peace Now leaders returned to renew their protest activities.

With the failure of mediatory attempts, the next major action taken by the Peace Now movement consisted of the construction of a 4,000 person chain stretching from Sha'ar in Tel Aviv to the Prime Minister's office in Jerusalem. Taking up positions on the northern border of the highway between Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, the protesters held up black and red signs in Hebrew and English calling again for the Begin government to adjust its policies.[109] The Jerusalem Post reported that "A large number of drivers returned waves with the two fingered peace sign. Arabs smiled and waved."[110]

These events were widely covered by the international media. As such, some American-Jewish intellectuals who had withheld criticism of the Begin

government until that point, now felt that the time was appropriate to voice their opinion. In a front page message published in the New York Times, Nobel Prize Laureate Saul Bellow and 35 other Jewish intellectuals signed a letter expressing support for Peace Now and criticizing Begin's conservative view of Jewish history.[111] Jewish support for Peace Now in the Diaspora, and a predictable backlash, echoed throughout Europe and North America.[112]

The month of May was characterized by a number of interactions between Peace Now and the defenders of the establishment. While Peace Now claimed credit for Sadat's renewed peace initiatives.[113] businessmen,[114] academicians,[115] and former Prime Minister Golda Meir[116] voiced opposition to Peace Now. On May 15, Abie Nathan, broadcaster for "Voice of Peace" radio station, began a 43 day hunger strike for peace. On the 30th day, some 60,000 individuals joined Nathan in Tel Aviv for an evening of song and protest.[117] Nathan discontinued his strike when the Knesset, in a special session, requested that he stop for humanitarian reasons.[118]

The Secure Peace movement disbanded once it became apparent that government policy would remain steadfast in its "Greater Israel" philosophies. The Peace Now movement, however, attempted to gain wider support. Yet, the movement leaders purposefully did not elaborate on the initial demands issued in the Reserve Officers' Letter. They did not professionalize the infrastructure of the movement fearing that the movement spontaneity would be stifled. They did not allow Arabs into the movement, fearing charges of disloyalty. Finally, when Sadat reportedly praised Peace Now, the leaders responded with a letter saying that the movement did not support all of the Egyptian's terms for peace, thus

keeping the movement free of Arabic ties or association.[119]

The major event occurring during the months of July and August focused on a "Shabut Shalom" (Peace Holiday). Activists established roadside stands throughout the country, sold paraphanalia and gathered petitions. Begin's party claimed, in one of its continuing attacks on Peace Now, that the movement was financed by the CIA.[120]

To this point, the leaders and members of the movement had used a number of rhetorical strategies and tactics. While the Begin government and the members and leaders of the Secure Peace movement reacted as though the Peace Now movement had used a totalistic strategy of rhetorical confrontation, the "peace niks" themselves argued that they were sounding the conservative voice. That is, the themes seen in the rhetoric of the Peace Now movement (e.g., "Zionist Values not Territories" "Security, not Settlements") suggested that the Begin government, the Gush-Emunim, the Secure Peace movement and those on the ideological right had betrayed the values of the shared Judiac tradition. As such, the reply to Sadat and the refusal to allow Arabs to join the movement were both strategic attempts to guarantee purity of motive.

Note in particular the juxtaposition of the key phrases of Israeli identification (Zionist values and security) against the tangible results of the values of the establishment (territories and settlements). Both the establishment and the Peace Now movement claimed to have the True Vision of the Eretz Israel. Since both visions were mutually exclusive, the establishment perceived that the members and leaders of the Peace Now movement were rejecting the idea of the Eratz Israel, and as a result,

perceived Peace Now rhetoric as a totalistic strategy of confrontation. The Peace Now movement mirrored the reaction of the establishment by interpreting the counter-rhetoric as reactionary and misguided.

To this point, the drama operated within the confines of an agonistic ritual. The drama remained within the boundries of symbolic displays. Neither the Peace Now movement nor the establishment responded with violence or physically distructive acts. Peace Now orators continually stressed that they supported the idea of Israel but desired a change of policy. One Peace Now orator put it in this manner: "We are ready to go to battle again. But if a new war were to erupt tomorrow, we want to be sure that everything was done today in order to prevent it."[121] In a similar fashion, the establishment did not respond to the Peace Now movement with bayonets and tanks.

Incorporation. When President Carter invited Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin to Camp David, and both accepted, the peace forces had cause for hope. They augmented this hope by staging yet another rally. On the eve of the Camp David summit, over 50,000 people gathered in the city square in Tel Aviv to urge Begin to adopt a flexible negotiating posture. The now familiar slogans and banners, printed in a variety of languages, served to reiterate the movement's aspirations.[122] Begin could not have ignored this demonstration and it may have had a positive impact on Begin's negotiation attitude and may have been a factor in the success of the summit.[123]

When Prime Minister Begin returned home with the much desired peace, he was greeted at Ben Gurion airport by Peace Now members who carried

flowers and banners of welcome.[124] Ominously, members of the Gush Emunim greeted the Prime Minister with Neville Chamberlain style black umbrellas.[125] With the success of the Camp David summit with its vague but promising agreements to establish Palestinian autonomy, the breach was ostensibly resolved and the Peace Now movement deflated and remained dormant for three months.[126]

Yet, the movement was not allowed to die. Peace Now activists responded with organized protest against the post Camp David settlements of the Gush Emunim and to delays in the incorporation of the peace treaty. Although a peace treaty was signed in March of 1979, the Palestinian autonomy issue remained unresolved. The peace process had again been thwarted by the government's settlement policy, and in protest, 40,000 demonstrators gathered one more time in Tel Aviv.[127] Recently, Peace Now leadership has claimed 250,000 adherents and shifted its emphasis to the prevention of further settlements through non violent obstruction.[128]

Rhetorical Assessment and Influential Relationships

The consensus of evidence would suggest that Peace Now was modestly successful in achieving some of its specific goals. Predictably, Peace Now leader Omri Padan recently stated: "I believe that we also had some influence and contributed our part towards the effort to achieve peace."[129] Christian Century writer Paul Quing concluded that Peace Now "did have remarkable successes."[130] Anthropologist Lewis suggests that the Peace Now movement helped perpetuate a change in the constellation of public opinion favorable to the flexible negotiating approach the Prime Minister took at Camp David.[131] Perhaps the most important change brought about by the

movement was stated succinctly by one Israeli in this manner: "Because of the Peace Now movement, it is no longer a shame to say you are a 'dove' in Israel."[132] Hence, the ruling paradigm of the society had been modified.

But, as Professor James Andrews has observed, "success or failure of (a) movement to achieve specific goals at a particular point is not a sufficient measure of its rhetoric."[133] A survey of what Andrews terms "influential relationships" or the indirect consequences of a movement must be listed by the critic.[134]

A first indirect effect of the movement was to bring young people into the political life of Israel. The movement helped to spark a 30% increase in the membership of the Labor Party Young Guard and infused the party with the ideals and desires voiced by the peace activists.[135]

Israeli political scientist Allan Shapiro, however, suggested that the movement was important because "it was borne without and is not connected to any political party."[136] Shapiro further contends that "The political scene (in Israel) is open for a new set of voluntary organizations — a pressure group built around a cause, not ideology or interest."[137] Peace Now was and is one such organization.

Another important consequence of the movement was the linkage of the ideas of the Israeli dove, who tended to be of the intelligentsia, with the emotional energies of the Israeli common man. This may have helped to provide the balance a peace movement requires; for it would appear that successful peace movements need both emotion and intellect, piety and pragmatism.[138]

While it can be said that the movement achieved some important results, two additional questions must be addressed. First, why did the movement succeed in some of its goals? Second, did the movement exhibit socially and ethically responsible rhetorical choices? Movement scholars have noted three dilemmas inherent in the organization and maintenance of any movement. First, the problem of issue focus arises. If leaders focus on thematic unity, they will be unable to attract members with dissimilar views. If the leaders delimit the focus, the movement may lose support and continuity from within.[139] Here, the Peace Now leaders formed an astute rhetorical strategy. They refused to elaborate on the three vague principles stressed in the Reserve Officers' Letter. Since the principles were broad enough to attract and enlist support, yet lacking the details that would or could alienate those who would agree in principle but not policy, the dilemma was skirted.

A movement faces a second dilemma. If the movement lacks a formal institution or paid professionals, there may be a lack of continuity and organization in the movement. However, professionalization may dilute the spontaneity and élan so necessary to a movement.[140] The Peace Now leaders chose to remain non-professional and non-institutionalized. There were and are no paid officials and the movement remains a totally volunteer effort. By remaining outside the party system, the movement remains partially immune to issue fragmentation.[141] As a result, the movement retains its issue focus, its spontaneity and enthusiasm, but sacrifices the continuity and structure that institutionalized organizations provide.

Finally, the leadership of movements must establish a credible image. But frequently, leaders must perform aberrant acts to attract the attention of the mass media. Peace Now leadership was most careful to cultivate a responsible image. Petitions to the government were respectfully worded, rallies were non-violent and courteous in nature, and the movement was redressive, not revolutionary in intent. While confrontation was a rhetorical tactic, it was not used as a totalistic strategy. Peace Now leaders sounded the conservative voice at many junctures and used managerial rhetoric when the situation demanded.

These actions can be explained by the view of movements as agonistic rituals. The Peace Now movement utilized rhetorical strategies and tactics designed to symbolically confront the establishment with images of a new order. The aim was not revolution or rebellion, rather, it was corrective and redressive. The confrontational dramas juxtaposed, in a ritualistic fashion, the values gleaned from the phase of liminality against the values of an establishment which reflected a view of reality held by most Israelis during the phase of separation. Hence, the rhetoric of the Peace Now movement was a rhetoric of re-ordering, i.e., "A land of Peace instead of a Piece of Land." It was a symbolic rejection of the existing order which also mobilized and confirmed a new understanding and modified, through a ritualistic social drama, a significant societal paradigm.

It is apparent that the rhetorical strategies utilized were socially responsible and reasonable. The movement gave life to a philosophy that "Israel was founded in order to create a new Jewish society and not re-

create an old temple."[142] One can understand the world view of Mr. Begin and other like minded Israelis when one ponders the searing experience of the holocaust. Yet, ". . . the definition of Israel that justifies all of its policies by the memory of the holocaust neither honors those who died nor protects those who live."[143] The Peace Now movement formed in response to a vision of universal brotherhood gained during a peace ritual. Attempting to incorporate this vision into a reality, the protest movement confronted the establishment with non-violent symbolic attacks upon the value system of the Begin government and its supporters. To this extent, they were successful in voicing and actualizing on a wide scale a new Israeli philosophy which does not allow the past to control or define the future. As I.F. Stone has observed: "Universal values can only be the fruit of a universal vision, the greatness of the prophets lay in their overcoming ethnocentricity. A Lilliputian nationalism cannot distill truths for all mankind."[144]

[1]"Israel's Failure of Vision," The Listener, 18 Sept. 1975, p. 357.

[2]Dorit Gary, "Israel: Jews versus Jews," Atlantic, June, 1980, p. 18. We must be cautious about the use of the phrase "Israeli-people." As McGee has indicated, there is no "people" in any objective sense; rather, there are only individuals who collectively agree to a myth or fantasy of "nation" or "people" advanced by an advocate or advocates. According to McGee, a "people" is created and defined rhetorically and such definitions are in constant flux. The "gales of conversation" Saul Bellow witnessed and recorded in Jerusalem and the movements chronicled by Isaac are "rhetorical documents" of attempts by individuals and collectives to define the ideas of Zionism and Israel. This study details the efforts by a collective of Israelis to redefine the nature and purpose of Zionism and Israel. See Michael C. McGee, "In Search of "The People": A Rhetorical Alternative." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61 (1975), 235-249. Saul Bellow, To Jerusalem and Back (New York: Viking Press, 1976) p. 25; Rael Jean Isaac, Israel Divided (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1976); Michael C. McGee, "The Origins of 'Liberty'; A Feminization of Power," Communication Monographs, 47 (1980), 23-45.

[3]Sammy Smooha, Israel: Pluralism and Conflict (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978), p. 241.

[4]Penia Glazer and Myron Glazer, "War Resisters in the Land of Battle," Dissent, 24 (1977), pp. 295-296.

[5]"Liberals Declare Support for Government Peace Plans," Jerusalem Post, 4 April, 1978, p. 2.

[6]Suzanne V. Riches and Malcolm O. Sillars, "The Status of Movement Criticism," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44 (1980), 275-287. Riches and Sillars list eight different methodological approaches that critics can use. However, the authors conclude in this survey of the literature that many movement critics pay little heed to theory building and have ignored movements in non-Western countries. This study is an attempt to develop movement theory and to study a movement in a non-Western setting.

[7]Malcolm O. Sillars, "Defining Movements Rhetorically: Casting the Widest Net," Southern Speech Communication Journal, 46 (1980), p. 31.

[8]Michael C. Leff, "Interpretation and the Art of the Rhetorical Critic," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44 (1980), 337-349.

[9]Ralph R. Smith and Russel R. Windes, "The Innovational Movement: A Rhetorical Theory," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61 (1975), 140-153.

[10]For examples, see John C. Hammerback, "The Rhetoric of Righteous Reform: George Washington Julian's 1852 Campaign Against Slavery," Central States Speech Journal, 22 (1971), 85-93. (Neo-Aristotelian). James R. Andrews, "The Passionate Negation: The Chartist Movement in Rhetorical Perspective," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (1973), 196-208. (Bitzerian).

[11]Robert S. Cathcart, "New Approaches to the Study of Movements: Defining Movements Rhetorically," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 36 (1972), 82-88; Robert S. Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," Southern Speech Communication Journal, 43 (1978), 233-247.

[12]Cathcart, "New Approaches to the Study of Movements: Defining Movements Rhetorically," p. 88.

[13]Michael C. McGee, "In Search of 'The People', a Rhetorical Alternative," p. 235. Italics in original.

[14]Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," Robert L. Scott and Donald K. Smith, "The Rhetoric of Confrontation," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 55 (1969), 1-8.

[15]H. L. Nieburg, "Agonistics - Rituals of Conflict," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 391 (1970), p. 57.

[16]Nieburg, "Agonistics - Rituals of Conflict," p. 60.

[17]Monica Wilson, "Nyakyusa Ritual and Symbolism," American Anthropologist, 56 (1954), p. 240.

[18]Nieburg, "Agonistics - Rituals of Conflict," pp. 60-61. See also H. L. Nieburg, Culture Storm (New York: St. Martins Press, 1973), pp. 17-34. Max Gluckman, Politics, Law and Ritual in Tribal Society (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965).

[19]Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," pp. 235-236; Nieburg, "Agonistics - Rituals of Conflict," pp. 60-61.

[20]Nieburg, "Agonistics - Rituals of Conflict," p. 58.

[21]Nieburg, "Agonistics - Rituals of Conflict," p. 68.

[22]Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," p. 246.

[23]Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," p. 246.

[24]Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," p. 246.

[25]Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," p. 245.

[26]Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," pp. 241-245.

[27]Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," p. 246.

[28]Sillars, "Defining Movements Rhetorically: Casting the Widest Net," p. 25; Dan F. Hahn and Ruth M. Gonchar, "Social Movement Theory: A dead End," Communication Quarterly, 28 (1980), p. 61; David Zarefsky, "'Blowing the Whistle' on Movement Studies: A Response to Cathcart," E.C.A. Convention Paper, May 7, 1979, pp. 5-6. Quoted in Hahn and Conchar, "Social Movement Theory: A Dead End," p. 61.

[29]Zarefsky, "'Blowing the Whistle' on Movement Studies . . ." p. 5-6.

[30]Scott and Smith, "The Rhetoric of Confrontation," p. 7. Note also that Leland Griffin, a source that Cathcart frequently uses, does not limit the study of movement to one rhetorical form. In viewing movement through a Burkean prism, Griffin writes "(To study movements) . . . is to study forms in their particularity and plentitude, within the dramatistic form of movement itself: which is dialectical, analogic, triple tiered, an organic, progressive unfoldment." Leland Griffin, "A Dramatistic Theory of Movement," in Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, William H. Rueckert, ed. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 462.

[31]Robert L. Scott, "The Conservative Voice in Radical Rhetoric: A Common Response to Division," Communication Monographs, 40 (1973), 123-135.

[32]Arnold van Gennep, The Rites of Passage, trans. Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960).

[33]Victor Turner, The Ritual Process (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969), p. 94.

[34]For an excellent description of the liminal state, see Victor Turner, The Forest of Symbols (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), pp. 93-111.

[35]Arnold Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 23 (1979), p. 686.

[36]Nieburg, "Agonistics - Ritual of Conflict," p. 57.

[37]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 687.

[38]Turner, The Ritual Process, pp. 94-95.

[39]Victor Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974), p. 17.

[40]Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, p. 17.

[41]Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, pp. 62-68.

[42]See Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of the Social Order," pp. 696-697.

[43]Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, pp. 37-42.

[44]Leland M. Griffin, "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements," John Bowers and Donovan Ochs, The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1970); Scott and Smith, "The Rhetoric of Confrontation,"

[45]Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, p. 43.

[46]Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, p. 43.

[47]Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, p. 43.

[48]Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, p. 38.

[49]Fredreic Bailey, quoted in Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, p. 38.

[50]Turner, Dramas Fields and Metaphors, p. 39.

[51]Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, p. 39.

[52]Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors, pp. 41-42.

[53]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order,"

[54]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order,"

[55]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," pp. 688-689.

[56]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 689.

[57]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 688-689.

[58]D. Ray Heisey, "The Rhetoric of the Arab-Israeli Conflict," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61 (1970), 12-21.

[59]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," pp. 691-695.

[60]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order, p. 692.

[61]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 696.

[62]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 692.

[63]David Ross, "The Projection of Credibility as a Rhetorical Strategy in Anwar el-Sadat's Address to the Israeli Parliment," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44 (1980), p. 75.

[64]Ross, "The Projection of Credibility as a Rhetorical Strategy . . ." p. 80.

[65]Ross, "The Projection of Credibility as a Rhetorical Strategy . . ." p. 80.

[66]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 697.

[67]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 697.

[68]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," pp. 694-695.

[69]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," pp. 696-698.

[70]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 698.

[71]Nafrau Safran, "Makers and Witnesses of History," New York Times Book Review, 7 May, 1978, p. 8.

[72]The Irgun blew up the King David Hotel, sabotaged railway lines, organized raids against the British authorities, and was implicated as the perpetrator of the Dir Yassin massacre.

[73]Menachem Begin, The Revolt (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. 32.

[74]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 696.

[75]Noam Chomsky, Peace in the Middle East (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), pp. 160-161.

[76]Lucina Franks, "The Divided Youth of Israel," New York Times Magazine, 24 February, 1980, p. 46.

[77]Franks, "The Divided Youth of Israel," p. 46.

[78]Boaz Ervon, "The New Israeli Peace Movement," New Outlook, September, 1978, p. 8. In order to provide a fair description of the Peace Now

movement, an attempt was made to balance the reports of the liberal New Outlook with those of the conservative Jerusalem Post.

[79]Phillip Gillon, "Anatomy of a Movement," Jerusalem Post Magazine, 14 April, 1978, pp. 9-10.

[80]"The Officers' Letter," New Outlook, 6 April, 1978, p. 55.

[81]"The Officers' Letter," New Outlook, p. 55.

[82]Gillon, "Anatomy of a Movement," p. 9.

[83]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," p. 698.

[84]Quoted in Paul Quiring, "Peace Now's Role in Israel," Christian Century, 11 October, 1978, p. 955.

[85]Gillon, "Anatomy of a Movement," p. 9.

[86]Frank Gervasi, The Life and Times of Menachem Begin (New York: Putnam, 1979), p. 337.

[87]Ralph Smith and Russel Windes, "The Rhetoric of Mobilization: Implications for the Study of Movements," Southern Speech Communication Journal, 42 (1976), 1-19.

[88]Smith and Windes, "The Rhetoric of Mobilization . . .", p. 2.

[89]Evron, "The New Israeli Peace Movement," p. 9.

[90]Evron, "The New Israeli Peace Movement," p. 9.

[91]Helda Dudman, "Politics and Manners," Jerusalem Post, 5 April, 1978, p. 10.

[92]As will be seen, the juxtaposition of values was a common strategy used by the peace advocates.

[93]Victor Cygielman, "Can Israel be 'Saved' by its Officers?" New Outlook, May/June, 1978, p. 56; "Liberals Support Government Peace Plans," Jerusalem Post, 4 April, 1978, p. 2.

[94]"Erlich Refuses to Apologize for Putsch Remarks on Officers," Jerusalem Post, 5 April, 1978, p. 2.

[95]"Erlich Refuses to Apologize for Putsch Remarks on Officers," Jerusalem Post, p. 2.

[96]"Erlich Refuses to Apologize for Putsch Remarks on Officers," Jerusalem Post, p. 2.

[97]Sarah Honig, "Movement for Secure Peace forms to Counter Peace Now," Jerusalem Post, 6 April, 1978, p. 3.

[98]"Israel: Songs of Peace," Newsweek, 8 May, 1978, p. 50.

[99]"Reserve Privates get in on Act," Jerusalem Post, 7 April, 1978, p. 3.

[100]"Movement for Secure Peace Forms to Counter Peace Now," Jerusalem Post, p. 3.

[101]Professor S. Sigelschiffer, Letter, Jerusalem Post, 13 April, 1978, p. 8.

[102]Professor S. Sigelschiffer, Letter, Jerusalem Post, p. 8.

[103]Quiring, "Peace Now's Role in Israel," p. 956.

[104]"Secure Peace Draws 30,000," Jerusalem Post, 16 April, 1978, p. 1.

[105]Joshua Brilliant, "Peace Now Demands Rejected by Begin," Jerusalem Post, 23 April, 1978, p. 2.

[106]"Israel: Songs of Peace," Newsweek, p. 50.

[107]"Israel: Songs of Peace," Newsweek, p. 50.

[108]"Israel: Songs of Peace," Newsweek, p. 50.

[109]"Peace Now Chain, Stretches from Sha'ar to J'lem," Jerusalem Post, 23 April, 1978, p. 2.

[110]"Peace Now Chain, Stretches from Sha'ar to J'lem," Jerusalem Post, p. 3.

[111]Linda Charlton, "36 Jews in U.S. Applaud Israelis Who Urged Flexibility on Peace," New York Times, 21 April, 1978, p. 1.

[112]Debate between American Jews on Israeli questions precedes the birth of the Peace Now movement. See for example, Noam Chomsky, Peace in the Middle East, for the view from the "left" and his nemesis Seymour Lipset, "The Left, the Jews and Israel," Encounter, December, 1969, pp. 24-35. As late as August, 1980 Ruth Wisse criticized American Jews for supporting the Peace Now movement. Ruth R. Wisse, "'Peace Now' and American Jews" Commentary, August, 1980, pp. 17-22.

[113]"Peace Now Claims Credit for Sadat's Renewed Efforts," Jerusalem Post, 3 May, 1978, p. 2.

[114]"Businessmen for Secure Peace Score PN Colleagues," Jerusalem Post, 3 May, 1978, p. 2.

[115]"Academics Say 'Peace Now' Harming Israel's Case Abroad," Jerusalem Post, 24 May, 1978, p. 3.

[116]"Golda Raps 'Peace Now' for Forgetting Peace Tomorrow," Jerusalem Post, 22 May, 1978, p. 2.

[117]"Abie Nathan's Hunger Strike," New Outlook, July/August, 1978, pp. 65-66.

[118]"Abie Nathan's Hunger Strike," New Outlook, p. 65-66.

[119]"Peace Now Opposed to Sadat's Terms," Jerusalem Post, 13 June, 1978, p. 2.

[120]"Peace Now News," New Outlook, July/August, 1978, pp. 63-64.

[121]"Victor Cygielman", "Can Israel be 'Saved' by its Officers?" p. 56.

[122]"Mass Peace Rally on Eve of Camp David." Jerusalem Post, 1 September, 1978, p. 1.

[123]Milton Viorst, "A Dialogue After Darkness," The Nation, 30 September, 1978, p. 293.

[124]"The Return of Peace Now," New Outlook, July/August, 1978, p. 2.

[125]"Gush Emunim," New Outlook, October, 1978, p. 61.

[126]"The Return of Peace Now," New Outlook, p. 75.

[127]"The Return of Peace Now," New Outlook, p. 75.

[128]"Raising the Profile," Jerusalem Post Magazine, 27 July, 1979, pp. 10-11.

[129]S' madar Shir, "Omri Padan: "We Made Our Contribution," New Outlook, November/December, 1978, p. 65.

[130]Paul Quiring, "Peace Now's Role in Israel," p. 955.

[131]Lewis, "The Peace Ritual and Israeli Images of Social Order," pp. 701-702.

[132]Quoted in Quiring, "Peace Now's Role in Israel," p. 955.

[133]James R. Andrews, "The Passionate Negation: The Chartist Movement in Rhetorical Perspective," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (1973), p. 197.

[134]James R. Andrews, "The Passionate Negation . . ." p. 197.

[135]Franks, "Divided Youth of Israel," p. 47.

[136]Allan Shapiro, "Doves, Hawks and Mocking Birds," Jerusalem Post, 17 April, 1978, p. 8.

[137]Shapiro, "Doves, Hawks and Mocking Birds," p. 8.

[138]"The Peace Front," New Outlook, September, 1978, p. 6. This is a partial answer to the questions Andrews posed at the conclusion of his facinating analysis of the British peace movements: "Can those who believe in the perfectibility of man ever convince a wide audience that "ideal" solutions are attainable? To what extent can idealists be pragmatic, and in what ways does pragmatism produce success (p. 436)?" see James R. Andrews, "Piety and Pragmatism: Rhetorical Aspects of the Early British Peace Movement," Speech Monographs, 34 (1967), 423-436.

[139]J. Robert Cox, "Perspectives on Rhetorical Criticism of Movements," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 38 (1974), p. 260.

[140]Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (1970), p. 6.

[141]Shapiro, "Doves, Hawks and Mocking Birds," p. 8.

[142]Paraphrase of Saul Bellow, in "Saul Bellow, Albert Memmi and Rabbi Arthur Herbert Support 'Peace Now,'" New Outlook, May/June, 1978, p. 59.

[143]Chomsky, Peace in the Middle East?, p. xi.

[144]I.F. Stone, "Holy War," New York Review of Books, 3 August, 1976 p. 6.